

REMARKS

Claims 1--15, 17-22, 24 and 25 are pending.

I. 35 USC § 112

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting that the Amendment of October 31, 2003 has overcome the rejection under 35 USC § 112.

II 35 USC § 103

A. Claims 1-15 and 17-25

Claims 1, 2, 4-15 and 17-25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over WO 97/39954 in view of Rehrig (U.S. Patent No. 3,565,278), Umiker (U.S. Patent No. 5,395,010) and WO 97/16353.

The Office Action asserts WO '954 teaches, inter alia, that the closed hollow profile is "attached at a symmetrical point whereby a gravity center line runs through the connection point and the opposite corner". However, claim 1 (from which every other pending claim depends), has been amended to recite the wall section being connected to the straight section of the frame. This feature is supported by originally filed claim 3 and Figs. 2a-2d. Thus, while the reference shows the wall section connected to the frame at the corner, the present claims recite that the wall is connected to a straight section of the frame.

By attaching the wall section to a straight section (claim 1), or at a gravity center line, deformities due to shrinkage can be reduced, if not eliminated. For example, with reference to Fig. 2a of the present specification, frame 2 is shown as a square. Because wall section 3 is attached to a straight section of the frame, when that straight section shrinks, it will not affect the corners of the frame. Therefore, the only deformation to be compensated for by resilient section 4 is produced by the shrinkage of the straight sections adjacent to the section where wall section 3 is attached. In contrast, when any of the straight sections of WO '954 shrink, there is no abatement of deformation resulting from placement of the connection between the wall section to the frame.

Claim 3 additionally recites that the connection between the wall section and at the frame is at the gravity center line of the frame. By locating the connection between the frame and the wall section at a gravity center line, in addition to being at a straight section of the frame, the forces caused by deformation are reduced even further, as little or no forces are generated from the straight section to which the wall section is connected.

As none of Rehrig, Umiker and WO 97/16353 teach these recited features, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection.

B. Claims 22-25

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Owsen (U.S. Patent No. 2,880,902), the alleged Admission of page 1 and Biglin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,634,182).

However, as claims 22, 24 and 25 (claim 23 having been cancelled) depend from claim 1 - a claim not alleged to be obvious in view of these references, reconsideration of this rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections are overcome. Thus, entry of the above amendments and passage of this application to allowance are respectfully requested.

If the examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephonic or personal interview would facilitate any additional issues leading to the allowance of the application, he is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 785-0100.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko

Registration No. 31,689

TPP/EPR

Attorney Docket No.: TPP 30873

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.

1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850

Washington, D.C. 20036

Telephone: (202) 785-0100

Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: Dec 16, 2003